DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 082 FL 004 112

AUTHOR Platt, J. T.
TITLE Nouns, Verbs and NP Complements.
INSTITUTION Monash Univ., Clayton, Victoria (Australia).
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 8p.; In Linguistic Communications, 3, 1971

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Descriptive Linguistics; *English; Grammar; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; *Nominals; Sentences; Sentence Structure; *Syntax; *Verbs

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates restrictions on three types of noun-phrase complements (gerundive, infinitive, clause) in English and seeks to point out some parallels between the occurrence of these three types in object positions. The author first presents a list of verbs which may be followed by noun-phrase complements; he then considers the occurrence of prepositions after the nominalized forms or nouns related to the verbs in the first list. A charting of co-occurrence possibilities in each case permits generalizations and categorization of particular behaviors. (VM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076082

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

In: Linguistic Communications; 3, 1971.

NOUNS, VERBS AND NP COMPLEMENTS

J T Platt, Monash University

Jacobs and Rosenbaum's treatment of NP Complementation (Jacobs and Rosenbaum, 1968) gives no explanation as to why there are restrictions on the occurrence of the three types of NP complement, namely: Gerundive, Infinitive and Clause (that is: the 'Possessive...-ing; (for)...to and (that) types, respectively).

In other words, why is:

(1) Osbert wants to go home
acceptable but not:
(2) *Osbert wants going home
or:
(3) *Osbert wants that he goes home
although I do feel that:
(4) Osbert wants it that he goes home
would be acceptable in some dialects of English.

This paper will make no claims to finding the reasons for these restrictions but it will point out some (I hope) interesting parallels between the occurrences of the three types of NP complementizers in Object positions, e.g.

(5) Algy proposes to go home
(6) Algy proposes going home
(7) Algy proposes that he go(es) home
(the option in (7) being the difference between the use or not of the subjunctive) and the occurrences of 'prepositions' (or should they not sometimes be considered as 'postpositions') after various nominalized forms of the verb - or if one prefers it - nouns related to those verbs.

First, I shall present the data in the form of a selection of verbs which may be followed by NP Complements. These will be shown as + or - in regard to their occurrence (in the writer's English) with the three types of NP Complement. Also, for the Infinite type complementation, it is necessary to indicate whether occurrences of same NP (with equi-NP deletion) may occur and/or whether occurrences of different NPs may occur as exemplified respectively by:

(8) Horace wants to kiss Aggie
(9) Horace wants Claude to kiss Aggie
For example, with try, equi-NP is possible as in:
(10) Fred tried to eat the schnitzel
but not different NP subjects as in:
(11) *Fred tried Aggie to eat the schnitzel.
These possibilities will therefore be indicated by the + or - signs in the additional columns ENP (equi-NP) and DNP (Different NP):

FL 004 112

TABLE A

	Gerundive	Infinitive		Clause
		FNP	DNP	
like	+	+	+	-
want	-	+	+	-
hope	-	+	+(1)	+
expect	-	+	+	+
fear	+	+	+(1)	+
regret	+	-	-	+
suppose	-	-	-	+
deny	+	-	-	+
enjoy	+	-	-	-
detest	+	-	-	-
plan	+	+	+(1)	-
arrange	-	+	+(1)	?
dislike	+	-	-	-
suspect	-	-	-	+
propose	+	+	+(1)	+
think	-	-	-	+
think of	+	-	-	-
think about	+	-	-	-
desire	-	+	+	+
long	-	+	+(1)	-
love	+	+	+	-
yearn	-	+	+(1)	-
try	+	+	+(1)	-

	Gerundive	Infinitive		Clause
		BNP	DNP	
attempt	+	+	+(1)	-
manage	-	+	+(1)	-
remember (A)	+	-	-	+
remember (b)	-	+	+(1)	-
claim	-	+	+(1)	+
believe	-	-	-	+
believe in	+	-	-	-
recollect	+	-	-	+
agree	-	-	-	+
agree to	+	+	+	-

---

(1) indicates occurrences only with *for*
remember A has the sense of "have a remembrance of"
remember B has the sense of "attempt to bear in mind"

We may now consider the occurrence of "prepositions" after the nominalized forms of (or nouns related to) the preceding verbs. Thus, with *love*, we may have:

(12) Dogsbody's love *for* Angelina
(13) Dogsbody's love *of* Angelina

but not:

(14) *Dogsbody's love *about* Angelina.

On the other hand, with *hope(s)*, we may have:

(15) Wilberforce's hope(s) *for* the future
(16) Wilberforce's hope(s) *about* the future

but not:

(17) Wilberforce's hope(s) *of* the future.

These possibilities of occurrence (for the writer's English) will be shown in Table B, according to what "preposition" occurs in the frame:

Wilberforce's _____ "PREP" + NP

TABLE B

	of/at	for	about/regarding/ concerning
liking	+	+	-
want	-	+?	-
hope	-	+	+
expectation	-	+	+
fear	+	+	+
regret	+	-	+
supposition	-	-	+
denial	+	-	+
enjoyment	+	-	-
detestation	+	-?	-
plan	+	+	+
arrangement	+	+	+
dislike	+(or towards)	+	-
suspicion	-	-	+
proposal	+	+	+
thought(s)	+	-	+
desire	-	+	+
longing	-	+	-
love	+	+	-
yearning	-	+	-
trial	+	+	-
attempt	at	+	-
management	+	+	-
remembrance	+	+	+

	of/at	for	about/regarding/ concerning
claim	--	+	+
belief	in		+
recollection	+	-	+
agreement	to	+	+

Comparing Tables A and B, we immediately see certain parallels. In general, these parallels are:

Verb + NP Complement	Nominal + Preposition
gerundive	N + of/at/to
infinitive	N + for
clause	N + about/regarding/concerning

However, the parallel is not absolute as an examination of Tables A and B will soon show. In addition, there is the problem of the occurrence of equi-NPs or different NPs in connection with the Infinitive complementation. (With the Gerundive type complementation, the same possibilities of occurrence seem to occur). Thus, the Infinitive complement occurrences marked (1) in Table A occur only (and then not for all speakers) if for also occurs, e.g.

(18) I tried to work/working in the garden

but not:

(19)*I tried your working/you to work in the garden

(at least if the first option in (19) is possible, it is with heavy stress on your.) With some speakers;

(19a) I tried for you to work/for your working in the garden

is possible.

Basically, one of the reasons for the occurrence of for with different NPs seems to be that the Subject of the main clause verb is what Fillmore refers to as Agentive (Fillmore, 1968). Thus: deny, plan, arrange, propose, try, attempt, manage, claim, agree (in one sense; make an agreement) and perhaps remember (in the sense of "try to avoid forgetting") are verbs implying the Agentive role whilst the others imply Fillmore's Dative (later Experiencer or in my terminology, Participative, cf. Platt, forthcoming). Note, by the way in regard to remember that the very similar verb recollect has only the one sense of remember, as may be seen in:

(20) I recollect Joe's coming here

(21) I recollect that Joe came here
(22) *I recollect Joe to come here

and:

(23) My recollection of Joe
(24) *My recollection for Joe
(25) My recollection about Joe.

Thus, if the main verb has a Dative (Experiencer, Participative) role Subject, different or equi-NP may occur without _for_. With an Agentive subject of the main verb, only equi-NP may occur unless _for_ occurs, and then some speakers of English would still be dubious in some cases.

Some other apparent irregularities are explained by a consideration of: _hope_, _long_, _yearn_, verbs which would imply a Dative (or Experiencer or Participative) subject as exemplified in:

(26) I hope for you to come
(27) I long for you to come
(28) I yearn for you to come.

The occurrence of _for_ here may be explained by considering that the verbs are: _hope for_, _long for_, _yearn for_. This may be seen by considering the Cleft Transformation:

(29) What I hope for is for you to come.
(30) What I long for is for you to come.
(31) What I yearn for is for you to come.

Notice the two occurrences of _for_ in each sentence. In a non-cleft sentence, both occurrences of _for_ are deleted with equi-NP but only one with different NPs. In the case of verbs like _want_, the single underlying _for_ is deleted with either equi- or different NPs.

We are still left with the problem of the occurrence of _for_ (for some speakers) with: _fear_, _plan_, _arrange_, _propose_, _try_, _attempt_, _manage_, _remember_ (P), _claim_, as in the following examples:

(32) I fear for you to come
(33) I plan for you to come
(34) I arranged for you to come
(35) I proposed for you to come
(36) I tried for you to come
(37) I attempted for you to come
(38) I managed for you to come
(39) I remembered for you to come
(40) I claimed for you to come

Why does _for_ occur in these sentences. Let us try the cleft transformation:

(41) What I fear for you is for you to come

and similarly with the others from (33) to (40). Admittedly, some of these are rather strange. We would probably choose another way to express the same meaning.

What I propose is that these verbs imply a Benefactive role. I am aware that Fillmore (1968) considers that Benefactive occurs only with Agentive but his comments there on Inner and Outer Benefactive have led me to reconsider the matter and I have proposed that in certain cases Benefactive may occur without Agentive (Platt, forthcoming). When the NP filling the Benefactive role is the same as the Subject NP in the main sentence, there is deletion of the Benefactive *for* as part of the equi-NP deletion.

Summarizing the matter of *for* occurrences in Infinitive complementation, we can see that there are 3 main types as in:

(42) (a) I want to come
(b) I want you to come
(43) (a) I long to come
(b) I long for you to come
(44) (a) I fear to come
(b) I fear for you to come.

The underlying structure of these might be shown informally as:

(45) (a) I want (I come)
(b) I want (you come)
(46) (a) I long for (I come)
(b) I long for (you come)
(47) (a) I fear for me (I come)
(b) I fear for you (you come)

The complementizer transformation will then produce structures like:

(48) (a) I want (for me to come)
(b) I want (for you to come)
(49) (a) I long for (for me to come)
(b) I long for (for you to come)
(50) (a) I fear for me (for me to come)
(b) I fear for you (for you to come)

A *for* deletion will delete the "complementizer" *for*, leaving:

(51) (a) I want me to come
(b) I want you to come
(52) (a) I long for me to come
(b) I long for you to come
(53) (a) I fear for me me to come
(b) I fear for you you to come

Lastly, a deletion transformation removes the second (and third if relevant) of any equi-NPs and any immediately preceding "Benefactive" *for*, giving:

(54) I want to come
(55) I long to come
(56) (a) I fear to come
(b) I fear for you to come.

Notice that in (56) (b), *for* is not deleted as it does not immediately precede the deleted second *you*.

I hope that the preceding remarks will be taken for what they are: an attempt to solve some of the mysteries in this particular area of English syntax. I should be pleased to receive any comments, either references to other work in this area or examples with other verbs, whether or not they back up my hypothesis.

REFERENCES:

Fillmore (1968) "The Case for Case" in: Bach, E. and Harms, R.T. Universals in Linguistic Theory, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jacobs, R.A. & P.S. Rosenbaum (1968) English Transformational Grammar, Blaisdell.

Platt, J.T. (forthcoming) Grammatical Form and Grammatical Meaning, North-Holland.